DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 231 95 UD 017 918

TITLE	Implications of "Follow-the-Child" Proposals. National Institute of Education Compensatory Education Study.
INSTITUTION	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Basic Skills Group. Teaching Div.
PUB DATE	29 Nov 77
NOTE	24p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attendance Patterns; *Change Agents; Compensatory Education Programs; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Minority Group Children; *School Attendance Legislation; School Integration; *Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Follow The Child

ABSTRACT

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is designed to provide special services to educationally disadvantaged children attending schools located within attendance areas with high concentrations of low income children. If attendance areas are changed, the concentrations of low income children within attendance areas also changes. In order to continue services to children who were receiving aid but who no longer attend schools within eligible attendance areas, a "follow-the-child" amendment was proposed as part of the 1976 Education Amendments. This was not accepted and the debate on this amendment continues. For example, one argument in favor of the issue is that if the funds do not "follow-the-child", parents would resist the prospect of their children losing services. This action may serve as a deterrent to desegregation. Opponents of the amendment, however, argue that the children affected by the redrawing of attendance areas are at no more of a disadvantage than the eligible children who have never received services. In addition, they point to administrative difficulties in implementing such a proposal. NIE has investigated the "follow-the-child" problem in three ways: (1) ways in which Title I students in school districts undergoing attendance area changes might lose services, (2) sources of flexibility in Title I regulations that would permit districts to continue serving children after school attendance areas are changed, and (3) an examination of the experiences of a large number of desegregated districts to determine whether the problems that exist in theory are actually serious in practice. The findings with respect to these three areas of inquiry are presented. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED150231

IMPLICATIONS OF "FOLLOW-THE-CHILD" PROPOSALS

November 29, 1977

National Institute of Education
Compensatory Education Study

UD 017918

IMPLICATIONS OF "FOLLOW-THE-CHILD" PROPOSALS

Within the last several years, a number of proposals have been made to amend Title I in order to allow Title I funds to "follow-the-child". As currently written, Title I is designed to provide special services to educationally disadvantaged children attending schools located within attendance areas with high concentrations of low-income children. If attendance areas are changed, the concentrations of low-income children within attendance areas also change. Advocates of "follow-the-child" amendments contend that children formerly receiving services may be denied them since they no longer attend schools within eligible attendance areas.

In response to this possible problem, Senator James Pearson of Kansas proposed a "follow-the-child" amendment as part of the 1976 Education Amendments. Senator Pearson's amendment was not accepted although the Emergency School Aid Act was amended in order to permit 5% of its special project funds to be used to provide services to children who had received Title I funded services and lost them when attendance areas changed as a result of the implementation of a desegregation plan.

The issue of "follow-the-child" continues, however, to be debated. For example, a state superintendent of public instruction recently told the House Committee on Education and Labor that Title I is a deterrent to desegregation since the funds do not "follow-the-child" and parents resist the prospect of their children losing services under desegregation plans.

Desegregation is not the only reason attendance areas change. A local school district told the same subcommittee, on the same day, that because of declining school enrollment, the district was required to close several schools. As a result of the closing of these schools, each of which had qualified for Title I services, children were transferred to other schools which did not, under the redrawn attendance areas, qualify for Title I funded services.

Opponents of "follow-the-child" proposals, however, argue that since only one-half to two-thirds of Title I eligible students are served, the children affected by the redrawing of attendance areas are at no more of a disadvantage than the eligible children who have never received services. In addition, they point to administrative difficulties in implementing such a proposal. They argue (1) that programs at eligible schools might be diluted in order to allow Title I services to follow students to non-eligible schools; (2) that per-pupil costs are high when there are only a small number of children in a school to be served; (3) that comparability would be difficult to monitor and (4) that inequities might result if some educationally disadvantaged children in a particular school received services while others, perhaps with greater educational need, did not. They contend that inadequate funding of Title I prevents districts from serving all their needy children, and that "inequities" in the distribution of services can be prevented only by full funding.

In response to a request from the House Education and Labor Committee, NIE investigated the "follow-the-child" problem in three ways. First, NIE examined existing Title I practices to identify ways in which children in school districts undergoing attendance area changes

might lose compensatory services. Second, NIE examined existing Title I regulations to identify potential sources of flexibility which would permit districts to continue serving children after school attendance areas were changed. Third, NIE examined the experience of a large number of desegregated districts to determine whether the problems that existed in theory are actually serious in practice. The findings with respect to the three areas of inquiry are presented separately below.

Ways in Which Students Might Lose Services

Children receiving services in a Title I eligible school may lose them if the school is no longer deemed eligible for Title I funded services. Such a situation might arise for a number of reasons. The implementation of a desegregation plan which alters the attendance areas from which schools draw their students, or declining enrollments in a district resulting in the merger of two or more attendance areas, might radically alter the income composition of attendance areas. As a result, some schools lose their Title I eligibility and students remaining in them can no longer be served.

A second problem is much more frequently cited. It arises when children receiving services in a Title I eligible school are transferred as a result of school attendance boundary changes to a different school which does not qualify for the Title I program. Such a situation could arise under both desegregation and merger plans, and is frequently cited as an obstacle to desegregation.

A variation of this second problem involves voluntary desegregation programs. It has been charged that voluntary desegregation plans are unlikely to be successful if the parent's decision to

transfer a Title I child to a new school results in the child being denied services.

Students also lose services because of other changes which are not a direct result of district level decisions to redraw attendance areas. For example, if income levels of residents in a particular attendance area rise appreciably, the school might no longer qualify for services. In addition, in districts with high mobility rates, children may lose services because their families move from eligible attendance areas within a district to ineligible ones.

Sources of Flexibility in the Regulations

As a second part of its analysis, NIE examined the existing regulatory structure to see if the existing regulations are flexible enough to permit districts to continue serving students when attendance areas are changed in the ways outlined above. NIE examined the regulations governing the determination of school and student eligibility for Title I services.[1]

School Eligibility: Schools are eligible for Title I funded services if they are located in school attendance areas with concentrations of low-income children as high, or higher, than the district-wide average. Districts are permitted to compute the average on a percentage basis or on the actual number of children. In fact, they can combine both the percentage and number methods as long as the number of attendance areas deemed eligible does not exceed the number deemed eligible under either method alone.

1 See Appendix A for a more complete summary of the regulations.

In addition, several regulations permit exceptions to the general rule outlined above:

- all attendance areas can be deemed eligible if there is "no-wide variance" in the concentrations of low-income children in the attendance areas in school districts;

- a school attendance area that was "formerly eligible" in either of the two preceding fiscal years and received Title I services in either year can be deemed eligible in the current fiscal year;

- attendance areas in which at least 30% of the students are from low-income families can automatically be considered eligible;

- a school can be eligible even if it is located in a non-eligible attendance area, provided that the school enrollment includes a higher number or proportion of low-income students than the district average.

Student Eligibility: The general rule governing student eligibility for Title I funded services is that eligible students shall be those who need special educational help in order to raise their level of educational attainment "to that appropriate to children of their age". If all eligible students cannot be served, the students selected to participate in the programs must be those "most in need" of special assistance.

As was the case with the school attendance area eligibility rules, a number of exceptions exist to the student selection and participation rules. The exceptions are of two kinds: those applying to children residing within eligible attendance areas and those applying to children residing outside eligible attendance areas.

A school district may, at its discretion, serve children who live in an eligible attendance area, but attend an ineligible school, if these children are identified as "most in need" or if they participated in a Title I project the previous year and are still educationally deprived.

The regulations also include an exception to the general school attendance area rules. This exception authorizes participation under certain limited circumstances by eligible children who do not reside in a Title I project area, if (1) the children meet all other participation criteria except residence; (2) their participation will not result in the exclusion of eligible children from the project area; (3) the project has been designed for selected children from the project area; and (4) such participation will neither impair the effectiveness of the project nor result in an extra cost.

Regulations and the Cited Difficulties: Applying these regulations to the difficulties cited by the advocates of "follow-the-child" provisions indicates that the problems they identify are not nearly as serious as they might appear.[2]

2 However, districts did report serious problems in the case of mid-year desegregation. The Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights under Law suggests that when a desegregation plan goes into effect in mid-year, the district, at its option, should be permitted to continue programs at their present location for the remainder of the school year.

The first difficulty identified was that students in eligible schools might lose services because the school attendance area of the school would be deemed ineligible.

The second difficulty was that students under desegregation plans or merger requirements might be transferred to noneligible schools and could no longer be served.

These asserted problems are clearly overstated. The regulations provide considerable flexibility in selecting both eligible schools and participating students, so that many, if not most, of the students likely to be affected by such changes may, in fact, continue to be served. In addition to the normal ranking procedures which are likely to result in many schools retaining their eligibility and others becoming newly eligible, several of the exceptions can be useful.

For example, if a desegregation plan succeeded in integrating school attendance areas not only racially but also economically, it is likely that the "no-wide variance" option could be applied in order to make all district school attendance areas eligible for Title I. Moreover, at least some districts might be able to use two exceptions discussed above in order to continue to serve formerly eligible students: (1) the "30% rule"; and (2) the option to provide services based on actual enrollment in low-income schools outside eligible attendance areas.

The "formerly eligible" rule might also be applied in some districts, although where all attendance areas are redrawn the rule cannot be applied since none of the new attendance areas "formerly" existed.

Finally, the regulations permit students residing in eligible project areas to be served under certain conditions if they voluntarily transfer to a school outside that area.

It is impossible to determine exactly how many children may lose services as a result of widespread redrawing of school attendance areas. But districts do enjoy considerable flexibility which they can use to continue to serve individual children after attendance areas are redrawn. How successful the districts are in using that flexibility can be learned only from a survey of their practical experience.

Survey Results

Use of Existing Regulations: In telephone conversations with 35 school districts[3], district Title I officials told NIE that problems do arise in continuing to serve children when school attendance areas are redrawn on a wide scale. However, the majority of these local officials maintained that the existing regulations provide them the flexibility they need to work out most of the problems they encounter. In general, they appear to rely upon the school selection regulations to adjust the pattern of Title I service delivery; rarely do they attempt to make use of the available exceptions to the student selection requirements in order to continue to serve specific students.

The districts are well aware of the requirement that schools be reranked and eligibility for Title I services re-established after attendance areas change. Moreover, many districts reported that

---

3 For a general description of the districts contacted, and the manner in which they were selected, see Appendix B.

reranking completely avoided the possibility that Title I participants might lose services after such changes. Specifically, these districts reported that after desegregation more schools became eligible for services than had been true in the past and that it was possible to reach all previous participants. Ranking on the basis of actual school enrollment was also used and proved helpful in selected cases.

Reranking as a solution to the problem was more successful in the small districts contacted than in the larger ones. In small districts, most schools became eligible after attendance area changes because desegregation resulted in a more homogeneous distribution of low-income children throughout the schools. This finding is consistent with data from the NIE National Survey of Compensatory Education which indicate that all districts which could qualify for the "no-wide variance" exception are small school districts with enrollments under 5,000.

Similarly, small districts which organized schools on new grade level groupings (e.g., one school for K-2, one for 3-6, one for 7-9, and one for 10-12) were also able to handle the problem fairly easily, because regulations permit eligibility to be determined separately within grade spans.

Reranking did not, however, completely solve the problem for some larger districts. As mentioned above, large districts generally cannot qualify for "no-wide variance". This is consistent with the National Survey data which show that there is a much wider variation in the distribution of poverty across schools in large school districts.

The larger districts tried other approaches. For example, where possible, they used the "formerly eligible" exception to reach additional schools. (It should be noted, however, that many districts, despite knowledge of the "formerly eligible" option, chose to ignore it because they felt it would spread the funds too thinly.) In addition, these districts often used other sources of funds to serve schools and students that were not eligible for Title I.

Use of Other Funds: Many districts used other sources of funds to continue delivering compensatory services to students who were no longer eligible for Title I. These sources include the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), State compensatory education programs, Title I migrant funds, School Aid for Federally Affected Areas ("impact aid"), and local funds[4].

By far the most frequently cited program for easing these problems was ESAA, a $214 million Federal program, which is awarded in state-by-state competitions and may be used to provide educational services for any student in a school affected by the implementation of a desegregation plan. Seventeen of the districts in this survey mentioned using ESAA funds to aid their desegregation efforts.

Some of these districts use ESAA funds in non-Title I schools to provide special services, similar to those funded by Title I, to ease the problems created when children lose Title I

---

4 However, at least one district could not comply with comparability requirements when it tried to use local funds to replace the Title I services lost as a result of attendance area changes.

services because of changes in attendance areas. However, other districts do not use the funds specifically for this purpose. The ESAA grants may be used instead at upper grade levels, whereas Title I tends to be focused on the elementary grades, or they may be used for human relations programs rather than basic skills instruction which Title I programs generally emphasize.

In districts using ESAA funds, however, there remains some difficulty. ESAA money is seen as "soft" money because of the competitive nature of the program; there is no way for districts to know whether they will have funds in subsequent years.

ESAA also provides for a small set-aside (about 1/2 million dollars, or 5% of the special projects set-aside) to be awarded in a national (rather than state-by-state) competition, intended to provide services similar to Title I to children who are moved out of target schools into schools where no Title I services are provided. This set-aside has yet to be implemented but it is a potential source of funds for districts which feel strongly that "follow-the-child" is necessary.

Thus, evidence from the districts surveyed by NIE indicates that the current regulations and the use of supplementary funding permit districts to continue to serve a very high proportion of the students served before attendance area changes were implemented.

There were, however, several districts in which some students lost services. For those districts, NIE attempted to determine the magnitude of the problem. In general, the problem does not appear to be very great in terms of either number of participants excluded or the priority placed by districts on reaching the previously served

children. For example, one school district which reported that significant needs remained estimated that these needs existed in three or four of the district's 70 elementary schools.

It should be emphasized that most districts considered the problem of participants losing services to be no greater a problem than the fact that many other needy children remain unserved. Repeatedly, respondents stated that those in need have always exceeded those served, and that the problems stemming from attendance area changes are not unique.

District Reactions to "Follow-the-Child" Proposals: The results of the conversations with school districts indicate that the majority of the districts are not in favor of the "follow-the-child" option. Only 6 of the 35 districts, 4 of them NIE demonstration districts, were in favor of such legislation and felt that it would be useful to them. Moreover, even these districts did not necessarily rate "follow-the-child" legislation as their top priority. Four other districts felt that the "follow-the-child" option would not be useful to them, although other districts might profit from such a provision. Three of these districts were small districts which were able to solve their own problems under the existing regulations; the fourth, a larger district, felt that the option was not administratively feasible for that district. These recommendations were generally accompanied by the caveat that additional funds would in all probability be necessary to implement such a change.

The remaining 25 districts did not support the "follow-the-child" option. Indeed, many of them were strongly opposed to it.

One local official described "follow-the-child" proposals as a "band-aid" for the much more serious problem that Title I is underfunded and districts cannot serve all needy students. A second Title I administrator stated that although educators would be distressed to witness participating children lose services, so many children needed special help that following children would amount to "robbing Peter to pay Paul".

In general, the thrust of these and other comments indicate that many local Title I personnel view "follow-the-child" proposals as being potentially disruptive to the underlying philosophy of the Title I program to serve low-achieving children in schools with the greatest concentrations of low-income children. These respondents feared that adopting "follow-the-child" proposals would result in dispersion of Title I services throughout the district.

In addition, several local administrators cited difficulties that might occur if "follow-the-child" provisions were adopted. These included:

- The likelihood that some children might be followed into non-Title I schools in which equally needy, and even more needy students, were denied services;
- The necessity of providing traveling teams of teachers, at considerable expense, to serve a more widely dispersed Title I eligible population;
- The possibility that "follow-the-child" provisions might, in effect, resegregate children within schools;

- The possibility of increasing racial tensions if minority students from schools eligible for Title I were "followed" into an ineligible school serving a predominantly white student body.

The district personnel did, however, suggest two other changes which they thought might improve the Title I program and also obviate the necessity for "follow-the-child" provisions. First, there was almost unanimous support for full funding of Title I. Second, some districts also favored more flexibility in selection of children, especially through the use of within district allocation of services based on student achievement. Eight of the 10 NIE demonstration districts surveyed favored using achievement criteria. Eight of the other 25 districts also suggested this option as a possible solution.

Conclusions

It appears, from the foregoing, that although there may be some children who lose services as a consequence of adjustments to school attendance area boundaries, the number of such children is not likely to be large.

This conclusion is supported by the following:

- Existing Title I regulations provide districts with considerable flexibility to adjust their programs after attendance area changes.

- Desegregation efforts and declining enrollments do not pose insurmountable problems for effective delivery of Title I services. When attendance

patterns are changed, districts do have to readjust their Title I programs and in some cases previously served children lose services. However, the number of schools and students who lose services does not appear to be large and districts generally do not feel that they are left with a major problem.

- The current provisions of the Title I program may complement integration efforts since several districts reported that they reached more schools after integration than before, and that they reached children of both minority and majority populations.

- Only isolated instances of support for a "follow-the-child" provision was expressed by 35 school districts contacted by NIE. The overriding opinion of the districts was that adoption of such a provision would pose administrative problems, could have negative social effects for the children followed, and might well run contrary to the aims of desegregation, resulting in actual resegregation.

- The districts did stress, however, that many needy children remain unserved for a variety of reasons. Almost every district felt that its problems could be alleviated by increased funding. Some districts also favored more flexibility in selection of children, especially through the use of within district allocation of services based on student achievement.

APPENDIX A

Regulations Governing the Determination of School and Student Eligibility for Title I Services

I. School Attendance Area Eligibility

A. Basic Determination

According to the regulations issued by OE, the LEA may use either of two basic methods for determining which school attendance areas within a district are considered as "having high concentrations of children from low-income families". Under the first method, only those school attendance areas with a percentage of children from low-income families at least as high as the district-wide average are eligible to participate in Title I programs ("percentage method"). (116a-20(b)(2)) Under the second method, only those school attendance areas in which the number of such children is at least as large as the average number of such children per attendance area in the district are eligible ("numerical method"). (116a.20(b)(3))

In addition, the regulations permit an LEA to have some areas ranked on one basis and some on the other. However, if a combination of the methods is used, "the number of attendance areas actually designated may not exceed the number of such areas that could be so designated if only one such method had been used". (116a.20(b)(4))

The revised regulations (116a.20(b)(5)) include a new provision which expressly authorizes the use of separate averages and separate rankings by grade span with respect to the application of the general school attendance area eligibility rules and the relevant exceptions, and the general targeting rules and the relevant exceptions.

These regulations also specify that the grade span groupings used for purposes of making school attendance area eligibility and targeting decisions must be the same groups used by the LEA for purposes of reporting comparability.

B. Exceptions

1. No-Wide Variance

The regulations provide that "if there is no-wide variance in the concentrations of children from low-income families among the several school attendance areas in a school district, the whole of that school district may at the option of the LEA be regarded as a project area." The regulations (116a.20(d)) contain an objective standard for determining when a "no-wide variance" situation exists. The LEA may make such a determination "only if the variation between the areas with the highest and the lowest percentage of such children is not more than one-third of the average percentage of children from low-income families in the district as a whole."

2. Formerly Eligible

Where a school attendance area does not meet the eligibility requirements but did meet the appropriate requirements in either of the two preceding fiscal years and received Title I services, that school attendance area shall be considered to meet the applicable criterion for that fiscal year. (116a.20(g))

3. Enrollment Option

The regulations implement this statutory provision by providing a standard to determine when this "enrollment option" may be used by an LEA. (116.a.20(h)) Title I services may be provided to public schools in non-qualifying school attendance areas "if the percentage or number of children from low-income families in average daily attendance at that school is at least as high as the district-wide average percentage or number required" for eligibility on an attendance area basis in accordance with the general school attendance area rules.

4. 30 Percent Rule

In addition, an LEA may specifically request that attendance areas in which at least 30 percent of the children are from low-income families be approved for participation in Title I (116a.20(b)(2)), even where the district-wide average is substantially higher.

II. School Attendance Area Targeting

The Title I legislation (141(a)(1)(B)) provides that payments under Title I must be used for programs and projects "which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress" toward meeting the needs of educationally deprived children in low-income areas.

In school districts in which it is not possible to comply with the above statutory requirement and at the same time serve all educationally deprived children in all eligible attendance areas, the regulations include specific rules for selecting the children and the areas which are to receive special assistance under Title I. The regulations explain that the above statutory provision may be satisfied either by limiting the number of children or areas.

A. General Rule -- No Skip Provision

The general rule concerning the designation of project areas from among eligible areas is commonly referred to as the "no-skip" provision. This provision generally states that an LEA may not designate a school attendance area as a project area "unless all attendance areas with a higher percentage or number of children of low-income families... have been so designated." (116a.20(c)(1))

B. Exceptions to No-Skip

1. Higher Incidence of Educational Deprivation

First, an LEA may skip a higher ranked school if a lower ranked school has a "substantially" higher incidence of educational deprivation. Specifically, the regulations (116a.20(c)(2)) provide that a higher ranked school may be skipped

> if such agency can demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the State educational agency, that the incidence and severity of educational deprivation in (the area having a higher incidence of low-income families) is substantially less than in other attendance areas proposed to be designated.

2. Schools Deemed Eligible in Accordance with the Formerly Eligible Rule

Earlier, the "formerly eligible" exception to the general eligibility rules was described. (116a.20(g)) This exception also serves as an exception to the targeting requirements. Thus, a school previously designated as a

project area school may continue to be so designated for an additional two years even if it is no longer one of the highest ranked schools.

3. Schools Receiving the Same Nature and Scope of Services from State Sources as Would Otherwise be Provided under Title I

Finally, an LEA may skip a school attendance area as a project area or for inclusion in a project area if it has been designated "to receive (through the use of funds from other sources) services of the same nature and scope as those that would otherwise be provided under Title I," e.g., state compensatory education funds. (116a.20(c)(1))

III. Child Eligibility and Targeting

A. Eligibility

1. Need for Educational Assistance

The term is defined in the Title I regulations to mean "(1) children who have need for special educational assistance in order that their level of educational attainment may be raised to that appropriate for children of their age, and (2) children who are handicapped." (116a.2)

2. Need Not Be Low-Income

"A child may not be excluded from participating in a project because he or she is not from a low-income family." (116a.21(e))

B. Targeting

1. Select Age or Grade Levels to Serve

First, an LEA, based on a review of "existing data... on the performance of the agency's basic programs of instruction of (eligible) children" must select the "age or grade levels at which it will operate the Title I project (or projects)." (116a.21(a))

2. Most in Need

Second, the LEA must determine the children within these groups that will be selected to participate in the Title I program. The children selected must be the educationally deprived children in each group that are "most in need" of special assistance. (116a.21(d))

C. Concentration

The project should be concentrated on a sufficiently limited number of educationally deprived children to show reasonable promise of meeting the educational objectives. (116a.22(b)(5))

D. Exceptions (District Options for Serving Other Children)

1. Targeting Prior Recipients

The revised regulations (116a.21(e)) indicate that a school district may, at its discretion, serve children who live in an eligible attendance area, but attend an ineligible school, if these children are identified as "most in need" or if they participated in a Title I project the previous year and are still educationally deprived.

2. Children Residing outside the Target Area

The general school attendance area rules provide that only educationally deprived children residing in project areas may participate in Title I programs. However, the regulations include an exception which, under certain limited circumstances, authorizes participation by eligible children who do not reside in the project area. The regulations set out four criteria that must be met before such children may participate in a Title I project.

- The children meet all other participation criteria other than residency
- Their participation will not result in the exclusion of children from the project area who meet participation criteria
- The project has been designed for the selected children from the project area and,
- Such participation will neither impair the effectiveness of the project nor result in any extra cost. (116a.22(b)(9))

IV. Other Relevant Regulations

A. Location of Services

Title I projects must be "carried out at locations where the needs of the children can best be served." (116a.19(c)) This suggests that it is appropriate to serve children in any school in the district if they otherwise would receive services and have moved to an ineligible school out of choice.

B. Not Maintaining Racial Isolation

LEAs cannot use Title I funds for building construction that maintains racial isolation. (116.32(b))

APPENDIX B

Survey of Desegregated Districts

NIE conducted telephone conversations with the Title I coordinators in 35 desegregated school districts to determine what problems the Title I regulations had caused during and after the desegregation process. The districts in the sample included 10 of the original 16 NIE demonstration districts which had recently desegregated and a sample of 25 other desegregated districts which were either selected by Applied Urbanetics, Inc., for its study of ESAA or were recommended by the ESAA office.

The sample districts were selected to represent a range of different locations, sizes, population characteristics, and desegregation plans. However, the sample cannot be considered representative of Title I or ESAA districts.

Districts were located in each of the 10 ESAA regions and in urban as well as rural areas. School enrollment ranged from approximately 360 students to 240,000 students; minority enrollment varied from 4% to 91%. Approximately half the districts were operating under court ordered desegregation plans and half were under voluntary plans. The length of time that districts were involved in desegregation ranged from approximately one to 18 years.

The responses of the NIE demonstration districts were compared with those of the other districts to determine whether there were any systematic differences. Aside from the fact that the demonstration districts showed more consistent approval of achievement based allocation, no differences were found.

Districts were also compared to determine whether recency of desegregation was related to their attitudes toward proposed legislative changes. There did not appear to be a relationship.